

AN OVERVIEW OF TRANSLATION STUDIES IN BULGARIA
THROUGH THE SECOND HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Roberto Adinolfi

According to the prominent Bulgarian literary critic and historian Petăr Dinekov, the origin of Bulgarian and Slavic translation theory dates back to Joan the Exarch.¹ In the preface to his translation of *The Fountain of Wisdom* by S. John of Damascus (translated around 893), Joan the Exarch rejects literal translation. Translations have been extremely important for the origin and development of Bulgarian literature since the Middle Ages. During the Bulgarian National Revival (*Vъзраждане*), between the late 18th and 19th centuries, new topic and literary genres spread in Bulgaria through translations from Modern Greek in the first stage, later from other languages. It should be underlined that several Bulgarian writers such as Ivan Vazov, Petko Slavejkov, Aleko Konstantinov, Pejo Javorov, Dimčo Debeljanov, Atanas Dalčev, Elizaveta Bagrjana, Blaga Dimitrova and many others were also translators.² Dalčev also made some observations about the ways of translation in his book *Fragmenti* (1967). However, not all Bulgarian translators agree on the importance of translation studies for their work; Ljubomir Iliev, translator of fiction literature from German, states: “As a translator, I am interested in translation theory as much as birds are interested in ornithology”.³

I will mention again Dinekov. Although the scholar explicitly states that he does not mean to theorize, he expresses some interesting opinions. He identifies three moments:⁴ 1. translations allow us to share the achievements

¹ P. Dinekov, *Prevodite v istorijata na Bălgarskata literatura* (Translations in the history of Bulgarian Literature), “Izkustvoto na Prevoda”, 2 (1977), p. 11.

² Cf. I. Vaseva, *Stilistika na prevoda* (Stylistics of Translation), Sofija, Nauka i izkustvo, 1989, p. 121; Ead., *Publikacii po teorija i istorija na prevoda i kritika na teoretični trudove prez 1981 g.* (Publications in theory and history of Translation and criticisms of theoretic works published in 1981), “Literaturna mišal”, 8 (1982), p. 135; P. Dinekov, *Prevodite v istorijata na Bălgarskata literatura*, cit., pp. 7-19.

³ See M. Bodakov, *Prevede ot...*, Sofija, Panorama, 2012, p. 81.

⁴ P. Dinekov, *Prevodite v istorijata na Bălgarskata literatura*, cit., p. 7.

of world literature and culture; 2. they influence the development of a national literature and help in forming a reading public; 3. they can be regarded as creative laboratories, with special regard to literary or poetic language.

Several scholars have dealt with translatology since the first half of the 20th century. One of the first and most prominent Bulgarian Translation theorists was Ljubomir Ognjanov-Rizor, who established the basis of Bulgarian translatology.⁵ As in the aforementioned cases, Ognjanov-Rizor was a translator himself; he translated some of Shakespeare's plays into Bulgarian.

Scholars such as Ivanka Vaseva, Anna Lilova, Aleksandăr Ljudskanov, Sider Florin, Sergej Vlachov, Henri Levenson, Ljuben Ljubenov, Elena Meteva and many others have written on this matter since the '50s. Translation studies underwent further development in the '70s and in the '80s: apart from books, many articles were published in specialized journals such as "Izkustvoto na prevoda", "Bălgarski ezik", "Ezik i Literatura". Some of them provide accounts regarding the status of research in Translation Theories, both in Bulgaria and abroad.⁶

It is worth noting that not all Bulgarian sources are written in Bulgarian. A few outstanding works are written in Russian, starting with S. Vlachov and S. Florin's *Neperevodimoe v perevode* (The Untranslatable in Translation), written in Russian and later translated into Bulgarian.⁷ Bulgarian scholars who wrote in Russian include I. Vaseva⁸ and S. Florin.⁹ Other sources are written in English; this is the case of the collection *Readings in General Translation Theory*, compiled by Bistra Aleksieva. It was at first printed in 1987, then reprinted in 1993, both times by Sofia University Press "St. Kliment Ochridski".¹⁰

⁵ L. Ognjanov-Rizor, *Osnovi na prevodačeskoto izkustvo* (Bases of the Art of Translation), Sofija, Kamara na Narodnata kultura, 1947.

⁶ I. Vaseva, *Publikacii po teorija i istorija na prevoda i kritika na teoretični trudove prez 1981 g.*, cit., pp. 127-137. The author criticizes some of the works published in 1981, however such an overview gives the reader precious bibliographical information.

⁷ S. Vlachov, S. Florin, *Neperevodimoe v perevode*, Moskva, Meždunarodnye otnošenija, 1980 [Moskva, Vysšaja Škola, 1986²]; *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, Sofija, Nauka i izkustvo, 1990.

⁸ I. Vaseva, *Teorija i praktika perevoda* (The Theory and Practice of Translation), Sofija, Nauka i iskusstvo, 1980.

⁹ S. Florin, *Muki perevodčeskie* (Troubles for translators), Moskva, Vysšaja Škola, 1983. In this book the author shares his personal experience as a translator.

¹⁰ Works by Bistra Aleksieva written in English include: *Levels of Semantic Analysis in Translation*, in *Translatologia Pragensia. I. Acta Universitas Carolinae*, "Philologica", 4-5,

Works were written in German by Krasimira Kočeva¹¹ and in French by Lăčezar Stančev.¹²

It is worth mentioning the collection edited by Palma Zlateva in 1994.¹³ It is the first noteworthy attempt to introduce Western readers to the theories by Bulgarian scholars. The collection opens with a preface by S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere, and an introduction by Zlateva. It includes articles by some of the foremost Bulgarian translation theorists: Iliana Vladova, Andrej Dančev,¹⁴ Bistra Aleksieva, Sider Florin; alongside, articles by Russian and Soviet scholars (Ja. Recker, Vl. Gak, L. Barchudarov, A. Švejcer, V. Komissarov, M. Brandes, I. Zimnjaja, L. Černjachovskaja) are published. Each article contains an introduction by A. Lefevere, which summarizes the main points.

In the foreword, Zlateva focuses on the different approach to the discipline by scholars from the West and from Russia and Bulgaria. For instance, “the whole debate on translatability, which paralyzed translation studies in the West for at least two decades after 1945, did not exert any comparable in-

Praha, Universita Karlova, 1989, pp. 3-40; Ead., *A Cognitive Approach to Translation Equivalence*, in *Proceedings of the XII World Congress of FIT*, ed. by M. Jovanović, Beograd, Prevodilac, 1990; Ead., *A Cognitive Approach to Translation Equivalence*, in *Translation as Social Action: Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives*, ed. by P. Zlateva, London-New York, Routledge, 1994; Ead., *Reading in the Special Theories of Translation (Pomagalo po specialnite teorii na prevoda)*, Sofija, “S. Kliment Ochridski” Univ. Press, 1987-1988 (1993²). A list of selected publication by B. Aleksieva can be found in *Cross-linguistic Interaction: Translation, Contrastive and Cognitive Studies. Liber Amicorum in Honour of Prof. Bistra Alexieva*, published on the occasion of her eightieth birthday, ed. by D. Jankova, Sofija, “S. Kliment Ochridski” Univ. Press, 2014, pp. 683-689.

¹¹ K. Kočeva, *Probleme des literarischen Übersetzens aus textlinguistischer Sicht. Dargestellt am Beispiel bulgarischer Übersetzungen zu Prosatexten aus der deutschen Gegenwartsliteratur*, Frankfurt am Main, Lang, 1992.

¹² L. Stančev, *Traducteurs, semeurs de rêves*, in *The Nature of Translation: Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, ed. by J. Holmes, Den Haag, Mouton, 1970, pp. 175-181.

¹³ See *Translation as Social Action: Russian and Bulgarian*, cit. The book is part of the series “Translation Studies”, edited by S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere.

¹⁴ The linguist Andrej Dančev is famous for having focused on transcription of Cyrillic texts into the Latin script and vice versa. He dealt with the latter questions in his book: *Bulgarian transcription of English names*, Sofija, Narodna Prosveta, 1982. Together with M. Savova, M. Holman and E. Dimova he designed the “Dančev System for the Romanization of Bulgarian”; see: A. Dančev, M. Holman, E. Dimova, M. Savova, *An English Dictionary of Bulgarian Names: Spelling and Pronunciation*, Sofija, Nauka i izkustvo, 1989.

fluence in Russia". The impossibility of translating and the huge number of translations are, according to the scholars, two "utterly irreconcilable positions", and "mental acrobatics" are required in order to reconcile them. Moreover, the critical vocabulary is stable in Russia and Bulgaria, whereas Western scholars "reinvent" it all the time. But the main difference, in Zlateva's opinion, is that in Russia and Bulgaria translation is regarded as a creative activity, whereas in the West it is considered a "meaningless drudgery" (sic!). Such a difference affects the way the authors deal with the subject. Russian and Bulgarian scholars do codify norms, but do not impose them to the translator (as their Western colleagues do, according to Zlateva). Problems such as the psychological aspect of the translation have not been paid attention to in the West. However, the author also finds some weak points in the studies collected in the volume. One of them is the "heavy, almost exclusive reliance on a positivistic ideal of science that tends to be viewed as out of date in the West. The question arises as to what extent scholars working inside the tradition represented here not only were cut off from recent developments in the philosophy of science, but also were constrained to work under the shadow of more or less dogmatic Marxism-Leninism as institutionalized in the former Soviet Union". Russian and Bulgarian tradition is also marked by a certain rhetoric, which is even more regrettable because "this kind of rhetoric would not infrequently manage to overshadow valuable insights".

Some of the work's flaws are focused on in some reviews.¹⁵ The book lacks an introduction explaining where, when and in what language the articles were written. No information is given regarding the authors and their activity.¹⁶ As for the different approaches by Eastern and Western scholars, according to Sohár "the reader may well wonder whether the differences have not been exaggerated a bit".¹⁷ Moreover, Cyrillic characters are sometimes improperly transcribed.¹⁸ However, the work's positive points are also recognized. The analysis of the process of translation activity and the different approaches to it (psychological, cognitive) make the book innovative.¹⁹

Western encyclopedias seldom include articles about Translation theory in Bulgaria, and some of them are not exhaustive.²⁰ However, some works

¹⁵ See the reviews by L. Salmon Kovarski in "AION Slavistica", 3 (1995), pp. 505-506, and A. Sohár in "Target", 7 (1995) 2, pp. 393-395.

¹⁶ L. Salmon Kovarski, cit., p. 505; A. Sohár, cit., p. 394.

¹⁷ A. Sohár, cit., p. 394.

¹⁸ L. Salmon Kovarski, cit., p. 506.

¹⁹ Ibidem.

²⁰ See A. Lilova, *Translation in the post-liberation period (1878 to the present)*, in M. Baker, K. Malmkjaer, *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*, London-New York, Rout-

have been published in several languages, as in the case of the essay *Preveždāt čovekāt i mašinata* by Aleksandār Ljudskanov. It was firstly printed in Sofia in 1967 by the publishing house Nauka i izkustvo. A French edition²¹ in two volumes dates back to 1969. It was compiled by Ljudskanov himself and can be considered a ‘second original’ rather than a translation. It is a limited edition. There is also a German edition from 1972.²² In 1975 an article in English was published;²³ although it bears the signature of Ljudskanov, it is actually a rework, made by Brian Harris, of an author’s speech in French. The same article announces the forthcoming publication of English and Polish translations of the book, which apparently were never made. The book was translated into Italian in 2008. The Italian version is not a full translation; it is reduced by about two-fifths of the original. Some parts closely linked to cybernetics have been removed, as well as two chapters on machine translation because they appear obsolete if compared with today’s technology.²⁴

Now, I would like to illustrate the content of some of the most important books. Given the lack of comprehensive studies on the subject and the non-exhaustive character of some encyclopedia articles, my work aims at providing a first review of the works by Bulgarian scholars, open to further discussion.

I will start with *Osnovi na prevodačeskoto izkustvo* by Ognjanov-Rizor. It is divided into two parts: *Teorija na prevodačeskoto tvorčestvo* and *Praktika na prevodačeskoto tvorčestvo*. The book can be considered prescriptive; it gives some rules on how to translate, but sometimes does not illustrate it in depth.

I will mention some of the views expressed by the author in the first part. He distances himself from authors such as K. Vossler and E. Elster, who regard language as a subjective and individual phenomenon; despite the fact that there are many varieties of the same language, depending on people’s

ledge, 2001, pp. 360-361; R. Lauer, *Die Übersetzungskultur in Bulgarien*, in *Übersetzung – Translation – Traduction: ein internationales Handbuch zur Übersetzungsforschung*, ed. by H. Kittel et al., III, Berlin-New York, De Gruyter, 2011, pp. 2103-2105.

²¹ A. Ljudskanov, *Traduction humaine et traduction mécanique*, Paris, Dunod, 1969.

²² Id., *Mensch und Maschine als Übersetzer*. Aus dem bulgarischen übersetzt von G. Jäger und H. Walter, München, Hueber, 1972.

²³ Id., *A semiotic approach to the Theory of Translation*, “Language Sciences”, (april 1975), pp. 5-8.

²⁴ Id., *Un approccio semiotico alla traduzione: dalla prospettiva informatica alla scienza traduttiva*, ed. italiana a c. di B. Osimo, Milano, Hoepli, 2008, pp. VII, XVIII.

social and cultural differences, every language has its “objective indices” (syntax, vocabulary, rhythm, musicality). These indices are totally untranslatable; every effort to preserve them in the translation is vain and violates the rules of translator’s language. Translators must preserve the content of the original work, but they must comply with the norms of their own language. Ognjanov-Rizor shares the view of Dialectical materialism, which regards the content as the most salient element. However, some elements that are usually considered as belonging to the form should be regarded as content instead; it concerns all individual peculiarities in the usage of vocabulary, syntax, rhythm and metre. Content is all that makes the author peculiar and different from his contemporaries.

The crucial role of translations is also focused on; translations make masterpieces accessible to readers from all over the world. A history of translated literature is provided in the third chapter; at the end of this chapter the author states that a translation theory is possible only on the basis of the literary theory of the Socialist realism. The fourth chapter is entitled “Enemies of the art of translation”: all who undervalue or criticize the art of translation are regarded as enemies. This category include scholars such as Vossler, who believe that translation is impossible²⁵ due to the fully subjective character of language. However, scholars are relatively harmless; according to Ognjanov-Rizor, bad translators and mean publishers should be regarded as the most dangerous enemies. A good translator must be able to render clearly and precisely the original text: according to the scholar, there cannot be unclear passages, since all has been clear to the author of the text.

The second part is divided into 12 chapters; “practical” questions such as the choice of the texts, the role of the dictionaries, the style, the influence of regional dialects and argots are analysed.²⁶

Another extremely important book is *Neperevodimoe v perevode*, by Vlachov and Florin. We should keep in mind that an article by the same authors, with the same title was published in 1969.²⁷ The authors further develop their views in the book. Perhaps the most salient point of the book is the first part, devoted to realia.²⁸ The word itself was not invented by Vlachov and Florin:

²⁵ Some of these ideas seems to anticipate those expressed in the preface of the mentioned book by Zlateva.

²⁶ L. Ognjanov-Rizor, *Osnovi na prevodačesko izkustvo*, cit., pp. 63-167.

²⁷ S. Vlachov, S. Florin, *Neperevodimoe v perevode*, “Masterstvo perevoda”, 6 (1969), pp. 432-456; *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, in *Izkustvoto na prevoda. Sbornik statii*, Sofija, Narodna kultura, 1969, pp. 46-72.

²⁸ S. Vlachov, S. Florin, *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit., (1), pp. 21-169.

other translation theorists have previously used it.²⁹ Vlachov and Florin conform to the definition of realia by the Soviet scholar Sobolev who regards them as the words which define certain objects, and not as the objects themselves.³⁰ The classification of realia by Vlachov and Florin has become quite famous outside Bulgaria.

Realia are words that denote objects, concepts and phenomena typical only of a particular culture. They show that the universes of reference of two different cultures never totally overlap.³¹ Vlachov and Florin divide them into categories, which in turn contain sub-categories:³² by object (these realia can be: geographic and ethnographic; related to everyday life; political and social); by place (national, local, or 'microlocal', i.e. typical of very small territories); by time (historical, contemporary).

Realia can be translated or transcribed: the authors give several suggestions in order to correctly translate them. First of all, it is necessary to determine whether a word is actually a realia. Some words are realia only in certain contexts: for instance, the word *mužik* is a realia only when it defines a serf.³³ Realia must never be transcribed if used figuratively in the original text. Transcription is necessary only if the words stand out in the original text; it should also be avoided when a similar word exists in the translator's language. The aim of transcribing realia is to preserve the atmosphere of the epoch and the geographical connotation of the book. However, using too many foreign words should be avoided, therefore realia do not need to be

²⁹ L.N. Sobolev, *Posobie po perevodu s russkogo jazyka na francuzskij* (A Manual of Translation from Russian into French), Moskva, Izdatel'stvo literatury na inostrannykh jazykach, 1952, p. 281; Id., *O perevode obraza obrazom* (On the transfer of images whit images), in *Voprosy chudožestvennogo perevoda. Sbornik statej* (Questions of fiction translation: collection of articles), Sost. Vl. Rossel's, Moskva, Sovetskij pisatel', 1955, p. 290; Vl. Rossel's, *O peredače nacional'noj formy v chudožestvennom perevode* (On the transfer of national form in fiction translation), "Družba narodov", 6 (1953), p. 277; A.V. Fëdorov, *Vvedenie v teoriju perevoda* (An Introduction to the Theory of Translation), Izd. 2-e, pererabotannoe, Moskva, Izdatel'stvo literatury na inostrannykh jazykach, 1958, p. 140. Cf. V.A. Vernigorova, *Perevod realij kak ob'ekta mežkul'turnoj komunikacii* (Translation of realia as an object of intercultural communication), "Molodoj učenyj", 3 (2010), p. 184.

³⁰ S. Vlachov, S. Florin, *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit., (2), p. 52.

³¹ S. Florin, *Realia in translation*, in *Translation as Social Action: Russian and Bulgarian*, cit., pp. 122-127.

³² S. Vlachov, S. Florin, *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit., (1), pp. 39-57; *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit. (2), pp. 49-51.

³³ S. Vlachov, S. Florin, *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit., (1), pp. 35-36; *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit., (2), p. 56.

transcribed if the original does not pay much attention to them.³⁴ They must not be replaced with other realia from other languages.³⁵

Apart from realia, the authors focus on other categories such as anachronisms, proper names, wordplays. Suggestions are also given in order to correctly translate wordplay.³⁶

After Vlachov and Florin many other authors went back to the problem of correct translation of realia. M. Ivanova criticized the Bulgarian translation from English of the film *The Man in the Iron Mask*, where D'Artagnan addresses the heir to the throne of France calling him "mylord". This is actually a mistake, because such words can be transcribed only if they fit the context, in the specific case if we are talking about an English nobleman; certainly not if we are talking about the heir to the throne of France.³⁷

The aforementioned *Teorija i praktika perevoda* by I. Vaseva contains an introduction and two parts. In the introduction, the author dwells upon the different kinds of translations and explains the bases of Translation theory, mentioning some of the main scholars from Bulgaria, the Soviet Union and other countries. The first part is devoted to the contemporary tendencies of Translation studies; attention is paid mainly to Soviet scholars such as A.V. Fëdorov, L. Barchudarov, V. Komissarov, Ja. Recker, A. Švejcer. In the second part, lexical, phraseological, grammatical and stylistic questions are focused on. Such questions include the difficulties that derive from the false friends and, once again, the translation of realia. The differences in the grammatical structure of Russian and Bulgarian are also deeply analysed.³⁸

Another crucial work is the book by Anna Lilova from 1981.³⁹ It is divided into eight chapters. In the first chapter, after having analysed the main aspects of translation activity, such as its social nature, linguistic and aesthetic aspects, the creative nature of translation process and its relation with the historic and cultural context, the scholar defines translation as a complex,

³⁴ S. Vlachov, S. Florin, *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit., (1), pp. 75-77; *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit., (2), p. 58.

³⁵ Some exceptions are given in S. Vlachov, S. Florin, *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit., (1), pp. 69-70.

³⁶ S. Vlachov, S. Florin, *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit., (1), pp. 304-338.

³⁷ M. Ivanova, *Za predavaneto na edin tip realii pri filmovija prevod* (About the rendering of a kind of realia in film translation), "Bălgarski ezik", (1981) 1, pp. 69-70.

³⁸ See also the review by D. Damjanova, "Bălgarski ezik", (1981) 2, pp. 164-165.

³⁹ A. Lilova, *Uvod v obštata teorija na prevoda* (An Introduction to general Theory of Translation), Sofija, Narodna kultura 1981.

many-sided, multipurpose phenomenon, which must be studied in all its components. The other chapters deal with the topic in a dialectical way: the dialectical unity of form and content, objective and subjective, national and international, historic and contemporary is explored. The social nature of translation, its functions and the kinds and genres of translation are dwelt upon in the last three chapters. In the eighth chapter Lilova identifies three *forms* of translation: written, oral and machine translation. These forms are divided into several kinds of translation: socio-political, literary, scientific and technological translation; the kinds of translation are in turn divided into genres.⁴⁰ The scholar proposes to further develop her views in the second part of her work, but this second part appears never to have been published.

I will mention again the collection *Readings in General translation theory*, compiled by Bistra Aleksieva. Unlike Zlateva's work, which helps Western readers get to know some works by Bulgarian authors, this book introduces Bulgarian readers with scholars from other countries. The book is a "collection of papers and excerpts from monographs" by several authors, including L. Barchudarov, J. Levý, R. Jakobson, A. Švejcer, V. Komissarov, E. Nida, P. Newmark, J.C. Catford, A.V. Fëdorov. It is a didactic text; as the author herself explains the aim of her book in the foreword, it "has been compiled in order to give the student a chance to familiarize himself with the original formulation of some of the most important theoretical approaches to central issues in General Translation Theory". A selected bibliography is also included.

The problem of translating from similar languages such as Russian into Bulgarian has drawn the attention of many scholars. The affinity between the two languages may lead to misinterpretation. According to Vaseva⁴¹ one of the main problems affecting many translations from Russian is literalism. The words that are similar in the two languages but have different meanings are regarded as particularly dangerous.⁴² Translating Russian diminutives with Bulgarian diminutives also leads to mistakes, because Bulgarian diminutives do not have the same nuances. Foreign constructions and word order are often arbitrarily copied. Russian words such as *Čeremucha*, *grač* are transcribed

⁴⁰ A. Lilova, *Uvod v obštata teorija na prevoda*, cit., pp. 292-313. See also A. Lilova, *Za njakoi osnovni metodologičeski principi na prevodoznanieto* (Some basic methodological principles of Translatology), "Izkustvoto na Prevoda", 2 (1977), pp. 91-120.

⁴¹ I. Vaseva, *Specifični trudnosti pri prevoda ot ruski na bālgarski ezik v oblastta na gramatikata i stilistikata* (Specific difficulties in translation from Russian into Bulgarian in the field of grammar and stylistics), "Izkustvoto na prevoda", 3 (1978), pp. 39-52.

⁴² Cf. L. Ognjanov-Rizor, *Osnovi na prevodačesko izkustvo*, cit., p. 95.

instead of being translated, although they are unknown to average readers.⁴³ More recent works address the same issues.⁴⁴

Attention is also paid to translations into Bulgarian from other Slavic languages such as Polish.⁴⁵ Iskra Likomanova devoted a whole book to Translation from Slavic languages into other Slavic languages.⁴⁶ Among the scholars who have devoted their works to translations from non-Slavic languages into Bulgarian, I will mention Ana Dimova,⁴⁷ who focuses on translations from German.

Several scholars have dealt with the translation of poetry and have expressed some opinions on this matter. For instance, according to Ljubenov⁴⁸ a translator should not try to recreate the strophe just by translating the words; poetic equivalents should be found. The translator should be endowed with poetic insight; he should be able to create rhymes like in the original poetry. The strophes should not be translated sequentially, because it does not give good results. Ljubenov enumerates twenty-one evaluation criteria for the translations. He also identifies three possible approaches to the extant translations of the same work: they can be fully ignored until the translation is published; thus, the coincidences will be few and fully fortuitous. A translator can look it up in the other translations once he finishes his work, or he can consult them before starting his own translation and keep them in mind during his work. This is the kind of approach the scholar prefers.⁴⁹

⁴³ Cf. I. Vaseva, *Otnovo za realite* (Again about realia), "Ezik i literatura", 5 (1976), p. 61; S. Vlachov, S. Florin, *Neprevedimoto v prevoda*, cit., (1), pp. 88-89.

⁴⁴ S. Tomanova, *Meždujezikovo vzaimodejstvie v prevoda ot ruski na bălgarski i ot bălgarski na ruski ezik* (Interlingual interaction in translation from Russian into Bulgarian and from Bulgarian into Russian), Blagoevgrad, Universitetsko izdatelstvo Neofit Rilski, 2009, pp. 54, 106-111.

⁴⁵ M. Ivanova, *Njakoi văprosi na prevoda ot polski na bălgarski ezik* (Some questions about translation from Polish into Bulgarian), "Bălgarski ezik", (1981) 5, pp. 448-451.

⁴⁶ I. Likomanova, *Slavjano-Slavjanskijat prevod. Lingvističen podchod kăm chudožestvenija tekst* (Translation from Slavic languages into Slavic languages. A linguistic approach to the literary text), Sofija, Universitetsko izdatelstvo Sveti Kliment Ochriski, 2006.

⁴⁷ A. Dimova, *Uvod v teorijata na prevoda* (An Introduction to the Theory of Translation), Šumen, Universitetsko izdatelstvo Episkop Konstantin Preslavski, 2000.

⁴⁸ L. Ljubenov, *Misli za prevoda na poezijata* (Reflections about translation of poetry), "Izkustvoto na prevoda", 3 (1978), pp. 128-143. See also Id., *Aktualni problemi na Bălgarskata prevodna poezija* (Essential problems of Bulgarian translation of poetry), "Sravnitelno literaturoznanie", 3 (1983), pp. 18-38.

⁴⁹ It is worth mentioning that Ljubenov, together with Iv. Ivanov, is one of the Bulgarian translators of the Divine Comedy.

Most of the mentioned works focus mainly on translations of literary works. It might also be added that some authors have paid attention to specific literary genres such as children's literature.⁵⁰ However, there are also works that deal specifically with the different ways of translation of terms related to Science and Technology. One of the main questions is when should foreign words be transcribed, thus becoming loanwords, and when should equivalent Bulgarian words be used.⁵¹

Given that a paper in this volume is specifically devoted to Ljudskanov, I would like to say a few words about his book *Preveždat čovekät i mašinata*. Therefore, I will mention his classification of the kinds of translations: 1. from a constructed language to another constructed language; 2. from a natural language to another natural language; 3. from a constructed language to a natural language or vice versa. According to Ljudskanov, there are three main translation genres: translations of scientific literature; translations of socio-political literature; translations of fiction.⁵²

Other works focus on aspects such as the correct translation of other categories such as acronyms and abbreviation⁵³ or geographical names.⁵⁴

To conclude, we can observe that Translation Studies have undergone an impressive development in Bulgaria since the second half of the 20th century. A wide range of aspects has been examined; the correct ways of translation of all kinds of texts have been deeply studied. Some of the results achieved by Bulgarian scholars have come into prominence in an international framework. Translation Studies occupy a prominent place in Bulgarian Linguistic research. The large number of books and articles on this matter witnesses the great significance achieved by this field of study in Bulgaria over the last decades.

⁵⁰ M. Vasova Kadynkova, *Specifika perevoda detskoj literatury* (Specific features of translation of children literature), "Slavica Slovaca", 2 (1981), pp. 130-135.

⁵¹ For instance, according to K. Cankov, the use of the Russian word *lesopila* (chainsaw) is fully inappropriate, since it is incomprehensible for the Bulgarian audience. K. Cankov, *Što za istrument e lesopilata?* (What kind of tool is *lesopila*?), "Bälgarski ezik", (1981) 1, pp. 70-71. Other terms are focused on in L. Ljubenov, *Njakoi tipični greški pri prevoda na naučna elektrotehnička literatura ot ruski ezik*, in *Ezikovi problemi na prevoda: ruski ezik* (Linguistic problem of translation: Russian language), Säst. I. Vaseva, Sofija, Nauka i izkustvo, 1989, pp. 181-186.

⁵² A. Ljudskanov, *Preveždat čovekät i mašinata*, cit., pp. 101-104.

⁵³ B. Paraškevov, *Nemski abreviaturi v bälgarskija ezik*, "Bälgarski ezik", (1981) 1, pp. 63-65; L. Jordanova, *Tematična klasifikacija na abreviaturite v Bälgarskija knižoven ezik*, "Ezik i literatura", (1981) 1, pp. 87-89.

⁵⁴ V. Stankov, *Za predavaneto na njakoi italianski geografski imena v bälgarskija ezik*, "Bälgarski ezik", (1981) 5, pp. 466-467.